DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

ORIGINAL

Before the Federal Communications Commission Washington, D.C. 20554

R	E	C	E	Į۷	E	
, ,	_	V	ᆫ	1 V	ь	

JUN[1.6] 2003.

)	,
))	FEDFRAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY
)	MM Docket No. 00-148
)	RM-9939
)	RM-10198
)	
)	
)	
)	
)	
)	
))))))))))

To: Chief, Audio Division

Media Bureau

PETITION FOR PARTIAL RECONSIDERATION AND REQUEST FOR EXPEDITED ACTION

Rawhide Radio, LLC, Capstar TX Limited Partnership, and Clear Channel Broadcasting Licenses, Inc. (collectively "Joint Petitioners"), by their counsel, pursuant to Section 1.429 of the Commission's Rules, 47 C.F.R. § 1.429, hereby petition for partial reconsideration of the *Report and Order* in the above-captioned proceeding, DA 03-1533 (rel. May 8, 2003). The *Report and Order* reviewed Joint Petitioners' Counterproposal and severed it into two parts. The Joint Petitioners ask the Commission to (i) reconsider that portion of the *Report and Order* which summarily dismissed the portion of their proposal to amend the FM Table of Allotments set forth in the footnote below (hereinafter "Proposal")^{1/2} and (ii) issue a notice of proposed rule making

The Joint Petitioners' Proposal consists of the following changes to the FM Table of Allotments: (1) reallot Channel 249C1 from McQueeney, Texas to Converse, Texas (KVCQ); (2) allot Channel 232A to Flatonia, Texas; (3) delete Channel 244C1 at Georgetown, Texas and allot Channel 243C2 to Lago Vista, Texas (KHFI); (4) substitute Channel 256A for Channel 243A at Ingram, Texas (vacant); (5) delete Channel 248C at Waco, Texas and allot Channel 247C1 to Lakeway, Texas (KWTX); (6) substitute Channel 297A for Channel 242A at Llano, Texas (KBAE); (7) substitute Channel 249A for Channel 297A at Nolanville, Texas (KLFX); and (8) substitute Channel 245C1 for Channel 247C at San Antonio, Texas (KAJA).

which includes the elements of the Proposal, together with conflicting FM rule making proposals which were filed with the Commission by other parties subsequent to the filing of the Counterproposal. Due to the excessive delay (two and one-half years) in taking the initial action on the Proposal, the Joint Petitioners request that the Commission take this action on an expedited basis. In support, the following is stated:

1. This proceeding initially involved a proposal to add an FM channel to Quanah, Texas. See Notice of Proposed Rule Making, 15 FCC Rcd 15809 (2002) ("NPRM"). The Joint Petitioners timely filed a Counterproposal on October 10, 2000 which involved various communities in Texas and Oklahoma. Two and one-half years later, the Commission issued the Report and Order, which considered the Proposal as being separate and distinct from other elements of the counterproposal. It denied the other elements of the counterproposal due to a short spacing between the proposed substitution of Channel 230C1 at Archer City, Texas, and the then-pending application for Station KICM, Krum, Texas. Report and Order at ¶¶ 4-5. It also denied the Proposal, but not because of any technical defect – rather, solely on the ground that it did not conflict with the proposed allotment to Quanah, Texas, as set forth in the NPRM.^{2/} Report and Order at ¶¶ 6-7.

The Commission also stated that it "no longer entertains alternative proposals set forth in counterproposals," citing Winslow, Camp Verde, Mayer and Sun City West, Arizona, 16 FCC Rcd 9551 (2001). However, this policy does not bar acceptance and consideration of the Joint Petitioners' Proposal for two reasons. First, this Proposal predates the stated change in policy. It was filed on October 10, 2000, at a time when the Commission routinely accepted and processed alternative proposals. The Commission did not change that policy until May, 2001. Winslow, supra. In doing so, it stated that the policy would become effective as to "an initial petition for rule making or in a counterproposal" upon publication in the Federal Register. Id. See 66 Fed. Reg. 29237 (May 30, 2001). It therefore has no applicability to the prior-filed instant Proposal. Second, the instant Proposal is not an "alternative proposal" within the scope of the Winslow policy. That policy was expressly designed to prevent alternatives in which the Commission was put to a choice as to which alternative to adopt, and consequently open itself to second-guessing on reconsideration. See Winslow, supra, 16 FCC Red at 9555 ("even a single optional or alternative proposal has required us to speculate on the proposal actually preferred by the proponent or what proposal would, in our view, have the greatest public interest benefit."). In this case, there was no choice. If the counterproposal as a whole were defective, then one or the other of the two severed portions would necessarily be defective as well. Thus, only one of them could be grantable, and the Commission was not required Cont'd. . . .

- 2. There is no dispute that the Proposal, standing alone, was facially acceptable. Accordingly, the Joint Petitioners submit that the Commission was *required* to consider the Proposal on its own merits and erred in dismissing it entirely. The Commission's decision to dismiss the Proposal without substantive consideration was contrary to principles of fundamental due process as embodied in the Administrative Procedure Act, inconsistent with a substantial body of case law (including a case decided as recently as May 30, 2003), and contrary to the public interest.
- 3. Under 5 U.S.C. § 553(e) of the APA, the Commission is required to give an interested person the right to petition for the issuance of a rule. If such a petition is denied, the agency must give prompt notice of its denial, and the reasons therefor. 5 U.S.C. § 555(e). It is not within the Commission's power to reject a petition for rule making outright unless it is patently defective. *National Org. for the Reform of Marijuana Laws v. Ingersoll*, 497 F.2d 654 (D.C. Cir. 1974); *See Municipal Light Boards v. FPC*, 450 F.2d 1341, 1345 (D.C. Cir. 1971), cert. denied, 405 U.S. 989 (1972) (rejection of a filing is appropriate if "the filing is so deficient on its face that the agency may properly return it to the filing party without even awaiting a responsive filing by any other party in interest"). The Joint Petitioners' Proposal was clearly *not* deficient on its face. Hence, the Commission was required to consider its merits.
- 4. Since the formation of the FM Table of Allotments, the Commission has entertained proposals for rule making to amend the FM Table of Allotments on a first-come, first-served basis. A *counterproposal* is simply a proposal for rule making that is mutually

^{. . .} Cont'd.

to choose. Since the Commission found that the Joint Petitioners' Proposal was not in conflict with the proposed allotment to Quanah, Texas, it correctly treated it as a separate Proposal, not as an alternative. Thus, the *Winslow* policy was not a bar to accepting the Proposal and issuing a notice of proposed rule making.

of BC Docket 80-90 to Increase the Availability of FM Broadcast Assignments, 5 FCC Red 931 (1990). It is the element of mutual exclusivity that converts a proposal into a counterproposal. See Pinewood, South Carolina, 5 FCC Red 7609 (1990) (a mutually exclusive rule making proposal submitted by the counterproposal deadline in a proceeding is considered in the context of that proceeding).

5. On the other hand, if mutual exclusivity is not present, an FM rule making counterproposal is just like any other proposal to amend the FM Table of Allotments, and must be accepted and considered like every other FM rule making proposal, based on the date it was filed with the Commission. The Commission has consistently followed this rule. Most recently, in Noblesville, Indianapolis, and Fishers, Indiana, DA 03-1118 (rel. May 30, 2003), the Commission rejected a proposal that was not mutually exclusive with the original petition, but held that the proposal would be considered in a separate proceeding. Id. at ¶¶ 1 and 3 n.4. This is virtually identical to the present situation. See also Saratoga, Wyoming et al., 15 FCC Rcd 10358, 10359 (2000) (counterproposal no longer in conflict with initial proposal treated as a new petition for rule making in a separate proceeding); Alva, Oklahoma, et al., 11 FCC Red 20915 (1996) (counterproposal not in conflict with initial proposal accepted as a new petition); Oakdale and Campti, Louisiana, 7 FCC Red 1033 n.5 (1992) (proposal not in conflict with initial proposal set forth in separate notice of proposed rule making); Kingston, Tennessee, 2 FCC Rcd 3589 n.1 (1987) (proposal not in conflict with pending proposal accepted in a proceeding); Cazenovia, New York, et al., 2 FCC Red 1169, 1171 n.2 (1987) (separate proceeding initiated to address non-conflicting counterproposal filed elsewhere). In the Report and Order, the Commission gave no reason why it treated the Joint Petitioners' Proposal differently than these

other proposals which involved counterproposals found not to be in conflict with initial rule making proposals.³⁷ By failing to issue a separate notice of proposed rule making for the Proposal, the Commission deviated from past practice and did not act in accordance with the public interest.

6. The Commission must accept the Joint Petitioners' Proposal as a new petition for rule making on a nunc pro tunc basis – that is, with a priority dating back to the date it was filed, October 10, 2000. It is not appropriate for the Commission to dismiss the Proposal after two and one-half years and invite the Joint Petitioners to refile it, particularly given the Commission's actions in the intervening years since it was filed. In theory, if the Commission had done everything correctly, the Proposal would have been afforded protection from untimely applications and petitions, and the spectrum would currently be clear for the refiling of the same proposal. However, the Commission did not do everything correctly. Not only did it take two and one-half years - an unconscionable length of time - to find that the Joint Petitioners' Proposal did not conflict with the original proposal in the proceeding, but in violation of its own procedural rules, the Commission also accepted eight FM rule making proposals and granted one FM application which conflict with the Joint Petitioners' earlier filed Proposal. See Exhibit A. As the attached channel studies demonstrate, the Joint Petitioners cannot refile the Proposal as a new proposal, because it would conflict with numerous proposals which the Commission crroneously accepted after the Joint Petitioners' Proposal was filed. See Exhibit B.

A different situation is presented when a proposal is not mutually exclusive but rather *contingent* upon a specific outcome in a pending proceeding. In such situations, the Commission may dismiss the contingent proposal and it can be refiled when the proceeding has been concluded. *See Eufaula, Wagoner, Warner, and Sand Springs, Oklahoma*, 12 FCC Red 3743 (1997).

7. It would be unfair to require the Joint Petitioners to refile now, and somehow protect the subsequently filed proposals and allotments identified in Exhibit A, given that the Joint Petitioners filed first, and that the subsequent proposals were accepted erroneously. At this point, the Commission must consider the Joint Petitioners' Proposal in a new proceeding, dating back to the initial filing date of October 10, 2000. The Commission may also consider the proposals set forth in Exhibit A and consolidate them into one proceeding with the Joint Petitioners' Proposal.^{4/}

WHEREFORE, for the foregoing reasons, the Commission should issue a new notice of proposed rule making soliciting comment on Joint Petitioners' Proposal as originally filed on October 10, 2000, and the proposals set forth in Exhibit A. In view of the unconscionable length of time that has passed since the Proposal was filed, the Commission should take this action on an expedited basis.

One of these proposals, the allotment of Channel 232A at Victoria, Texas, was advanced in a counterproposal in MM Docket No. 02-248. However, this proceeding is still undecided, and the Victoria proposal could be consolidated with the Joint Petitioners' Proposal.

The conflicting construction permit for Channel 255C1 at Dilley, Texas (Station KLMO-FM) is another matter. The permit (BPH-20010102AAC) was issued in error because it conflicted with the prior-filed proposal to substitute Channel 256A at Ingram, Texas. Fortunately, there is a simple solution to this problem. The construction permit in fact does protect Channel 256A at Ingram. The permit was issued pursuant to Section 73.215 with respect to Stations KAYG, Camp Wood, Texas: KBUC, Pleasanton, Texas: and KJFK, Lampasas, Texas, and in affording contour protection to those stations it also affords contour protection to the Ingram allotment. Should the Joint Petitioners' Proposal be granted, the Dilley construction permit, with Section 73.215 protection towards Ingram, would not be affected.

Respectfully submitted,

CAPSTAR TX LIMITED PARTNERSHIP CLEAR CHANNEL BROADCASTING LICENSES, INC.

By:

Gregory L. Marter Sin

Wiley Rein & Fielding LLP

1776 K Street, NW

Washington, DC 20006

(202) 719-7370

Their Counsel

RAWHIDE RADIO, LLC

Mark N. Lipp^{5/}

J. Thomas Nolan

Vinson & Elkins, LLP

1455 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.

Washington, D.C. 20004

(202) 639-6500

Itș Co-Counsel

Laurence N. Cohn /)TN

Cohn and Marks

1920 N Street, N.W.

Suite 300

Washington, D.C. 20036-1622

(202) 452-4817

lts Co-Counsel

June 16, 2003

Please note the new address for counsel.

EXHIBIT A

	Channel	Docket	Community	Petitioner	<u>Date</u>	Comments
		<u>No.</u>			<u>Filed</u>	
1.	255C1	Unbuilt	Dilley, Texas	Dilley	1/2/01	Construction permit, File No. BPH-20010102AAO,
		(CP)		Broadcasters		granted 4/17/02, short-spaced to Channel 256A at
		KLMO-				Ingram, Texas. Provides Section 73.215 contour
		FM				protection to proposed Ingram allotment with no
						change in facilities.
2.	232A	01-105	Shiner, Texas	Stargazer	4/6/01	Conflicts with proposed allotment of Channel 232A
			,	Broadcasting,		at Flatonia, Texas.
				Inc.		
3.	256A	~	Harper, Texas	Charles	5/7/01	Conflicts with proposed substitution of Channel 256A
		<u> </u>		Crawford		for Channel 243A at Ingram, Texas.
4.	245C3	01-153	Tilden, Texas	Charles	5/18/01	Conflicts with proposed substitution of Channel
				Crawford		245C1 for Channel 247C at San Antonio, Texas.
5.	250A	01-130	Batesville, Texas	Charles	5/21/01	Conflicts with proposed reallotment of Channel
_	A 10.01			Crawford	5/23/01	249C1 from McQueeney to Converse, Texas.
6.	249C3	01-133	Mason, Texas	Charles	5/25/01	Conflicts with proposed reallotment of Channel
_	207.			Crawford	7/20/01	249C1 from McQueeney to Converse, Texas.
7.	297A	01-154	Goldthwaite,	Charles	5/29/01	Conflicts with proposed substitution of Channel 297A
O	242.4	01.100	Texas	Crawford	C/15/01	for Channel 242A at Llano, Texas.
8.	243A	01-188	Evant, Texas	Charles	6/15/01	Conflicts with proposed substitution of Channel
				Crawford		243C2 at Lago Vista, Texas for Channel 244C1 at
9.	232A	02.249	Viete sie Tenes	New Ulm	10/21/02	Georgetown, Texas.
9.	232A	02-248	Victoria, Texas		10/21/02	Conflicts with proposed allotment of Channel 232A at Flatonia, Texas.
				Broadcasting Co.		at Flatonia, Texas.
		L				<u> </u>



FAX WAS * Pg 2/10 Ma+.25. 2008 1:48PM Reynolds Technical Associates No.0359 P. 2

Channel 247C1 Lakeway Texas (KWTX) Allocation Study

REFERENCE DISPLAY DATES 30 18 27 N CLASS = C1 DATA 04-24-03 Current Spacings 97 46 46 W SEARCH 05-25-03 ------ Channel 247 - 97.3 MHz -----

Call	,	Channel	Location		Dist	Azi	FCC	Margin
RADD	ADD	247Ç1	Lakeway	ТX	0.00	0.0	245.0	-245.00
RDEL	DEL	248C	Waco	\mathtt{TX}	0.00	0.0	209.0	-209.00
KAJA	LIC	247C	San Antonio	TX	125.95	226.5	270.0	-144.05
RDEL	DEL	247C	San Antonio	TX	131.56	227.3	270.0	-138.44
KWTXFM	LIC	248C	Waco	TX	122.70	21.2	209.0	-86.30
KWTXFM	CP	248C	Waco	TX	122.73	21.3	209.0	-86.27
RDEL	DEL	244C1	Georgetown	TX	2.63	308.6	82.0	-79.37
KHFIFM	LIC	244C1	Georgetown	$\mathbf{T}\mathbf{X}$	2.63	308.6	82.0	-79.37
RDEL	DEL	244Cl	Georgetown	$\mathbf{T}\mathbf{X}$	19.20	328.5	82.0	-62.80
R AD D	ADD	248C2	Marlin	TX	111.55	32.1	158.0	-46.45
RDEL	DEL	248C2	Waco	TX	144.96	22.4	158.0	-13.04
RADD	ADD	249A	Nolanville	TX	89.23	12.2	75.0	14.23
ALLO	RSV	249C1	Mcqueeney	TX	105.99	173.9	82.0	23.99
KVCQ.C	CP	249C1	Mcqueeney	ΥX	107.38	173.1	82.0	25.38
RADD	ADD	249C1	Converse	$\mathtt{X}\mathtt{T}$	119.75	214.7	82.0	37.75
RDEL	DEL	249C1	Mcqueeney	TX	119. 7 5	214.7	82.0	37.75
\mathbf{RADD}	ADD	249Cl	Converse	TX	119.75	214.7	82.0	37.75
RADD	ADD	245C1	San Antonio	TX	131.56	227.3	82.0	49.56

Channel 245C1 San Antonio Texas (KAJA) Allocation Study

REFERENCE DISPLAY DATES 29 30 01 N CLASS = C1DATA 04-24-03 98 46 41 W Current Spacings SEARCH 05-25-03

	•		_	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •			
Call	Channel	Location		Dist	Azi	FCC	Margin
RADD	ADD 245C1	San Antonio	TX	0.00	0.0	245.0	-245.00
RDEL	DEL 247C	San Antonio	ТX	0.00	0.0	105.0	-105.00
KAJA	LIC 247C	San Antonio	TX	5.88	63.8	105.0	-99.12
RADD	ADD 245C3	Tilden	TX	115.28	167.0	211.0	-95.72
RDEL	DEL 244C1	Georgetown	TX	131.18	45.6	177.0	-45.82
KHFIFM	LIC 244C1	Georgetown	TX	131.18	45.6	177.0	-45.82
RDEL	DEL 244C1	Georgetown	TX	136.54	38.8	177.0	-40.46
ALLO	244	Piedras Negras	CI	190.58	242.9	209.0	-18.42
KIOXFM	LIC 245C1	El Campo	$\mathbf{T}\mathbf{X}$	244.51	105.5	245.0	-0.49
KXYLFM	LIC 245C1	Brownwood	${f T}{f X}$	245.29	355.1	245.0	0.29
ALLO	USE 245C1	Brownwood	ТX	245.29	355.1	245.0	0.29
ALLO	VAC 243A	Ingram	TX	77.53	325.5	75.0	2.53
RDEL	DEL 243A	Ingram	ТX	77.53	325.5	75.0	2.53
KXYLFM	CP 245C1	Brownwood	TX	254.82	348.2	245.0	9.82
KXTNFM	LIC 298C	San Antonio	ТX	55.78	116.6	41.0	14.78
\mathtt{RDEL}	DEL 248C	Waço	ТX	131.56	46.8	105.0	26.56
ALLO	246	Nuevo Laredo	AT	226.44	200.9	195.0	31.44
XHNLOF	OPE 246B	Nuevo Laredo	TA	234.75	197.7	195.0	39.75
ALLO	VAC 242A	Cotu l la	TX	118.05	201.0	75.0	43.05
RADD	ADD 247C1	Lakeway	TX	131.56	46.8	82.0	49.56
RADD	ADD 243C2	Lago Vista	TX	136.54	38.8	79.0	57.54
RADD	ADD 243C2	Lago Vista	TX	136.54	38.8	79.0	57.54
KBAE	LIC 242A	Llano	TX	133.02	8.5	75.0	58.02
RDEL	DEL 242A	Llano	TX	137.01	6.6	75.0	62.01
ALLO	VAC 242A	Yorktown	TX	139.47	111.1	75.0	64.47
RDEL	DEL 242A	Yorktown	TX	139.47	111.1	75.0	64.47
RADD	ADD 242A	Shiner	TX	146.30	91.0	75.0	71.30
RADD	ADD 242A	Flatonia	ТX	152.30	84.7	75.0	77.30
RVAC	VAC 299A	Leakey	ΤX	110.40	281.9	22.0	88.40

FAX WAS * Pg 4/10 Max.25. 2003 | 1:49PV | Reynolds Technical Associates

Channel 243C2 Lago Vista Texas (KHFI) Allocation Study

REFERENCE		DISPLAY DATES
30 27 18 N	CLASS = C2	DATA 04-24-03
97 53 03 W	Current Spacings	SEARCH 05-25-03
	Channel 243 - 96.5 MHz	

Call	Channel	Location		Dist	Azi	FCC	Margin
RADD	ADD 243C2	Lago Vista	ТX	0.00	0.0	190.0	-190.00
RADD	ADD 243C2	Lago Vista	ТX	0.00	0.0	190.0	-190.00
RDEL	DEL 244C1	Georgetown	ТX	0.00	0.0	158.0	-158.00
KHFIFM	LIC 244C1	Georgetown	$\mathbf{T}\mathbf{X}$	16.76	151.5	158.0	-141.24
RDEL	DEL 244C1	Georgetown	ТX	16.76	151.5	158.0	-141.24
RADD	ADD 243A	Evant	ТX	116.79	347.3	166.0	-49.21
KBAE	LIC 242A	Llano	TX	70.73	291.6	106.0	-35.27
RDEL	DEL 242A	Llano	$\mathbf{X}\mathbf{T}$	76.07	293.7	106.0	-29.93
RDEL	DEL 243A	Ingram	TX	136.65	252.3	166.0	-29.35
ALLO	VAC 243A	Ingram	$\mathbf{X}\mathbf{T}$	136.65	252.3	166.0	-29.35
KHMX	LIC 243C	Houston	XT	248.90	112.6	249.0	-0.10
ALLO	VAC 240A	Burnet	ТX	58.88	318.5	55.0	3.88
RADD	ADD 242A	Flatonia	TX	113.30	145.1	106.0	7.30
RADD	ADD 242A	Shiner	XT	124.32	151.5	106.0	18.32
KGSR	LIC 296C2	Bastrop	TX	47.18	141.6	20.0	27.18
RADD	ADD 240A	Giddings	ТX	85.33	104.6	55.0	30.33
KXXM	LIC 241C1	San Antonio	TX	116.09	218.4	79.0	37.09
RDEL	DEL 242A	Yorktown	TX	162.40	164.7	106.0	56.40
ALLO	VAC 242A	Yorktown	ТX	162.40	164.7	106.0	56.40
RADD	ADD 245C1	San Antonio	$\mathbf{T}\mathbf{X}$	136.54	219.3	79.0	57.54
KLFX	LIC 297A	Nolanville	TX	75.49	21.1	15.0	60.49
RADD	ADD 297A	Llano	TX	76.07	293.7		61.07
\mathtt{RDEL}	DEL 297A	Nolanville	TX	76.55	22.1	15.0	61.5 5
	APP 297A	Nolanville	TX	76.55	22.1	15.0	61.55
KSCS	LIC 242C	Fort Worth	TX	252.00	19.9	188.0	64.00
KLTG	LIC 243C1	Corpus Christi	TX	302.04	174.7	224.0	78.04
RADD	ADD 241C2	College Station	TX	1 45.36	76.2	58.0	87.36

FAX_WAS * Pg 5/10 Wa--25- 2038 T:49PM Reynolds Technical Associates

Channel 297A Llano Texas (KBAE) Allocation Study

REFERENCE	DISPLAY	Y DATES			
30 43 40 N		CLASS = A		DATA	04-24-03
98 36 43 W	98 36 43 W Current Spacings				
	Chan	nel 297 - 107.3 MHz			
Call Cha	annel Location	Dist	Azi	FCC	Margin

RADD ADD 297A Llano TX 0.00 0.0 115.0 -115.00 RADD ADD 297A Goldthwaite LIC 297A Nolanville KLFX KLFX.A APP 297A Nolanville DEL 297A Nolanville RDEL KXTNFM LIC 298C San Antonio KHLBFM LIC 295A Burnet RADD Junction ADD 297A KFANFM LIC 300C2 Johnson City KFANFM APP 300C2 Johnson City RADD ADD 296A Brady KGSR LIC 296C2 Bastrop

Channel 249A Nolanville Texas (KLFX) Allocation Study

REFERE 31 05 97 34	38 N 51 W	-	Ci Channe	rrent Spa	A cings 7.7 MHz -		DATA SEARCH	05-25-03
Call	Cha	annel	Location		Dist	Azi	FCC	Margin
KWTXFM	LIC 24	18C	Waco	TX	37.34	43.5	165.0	-127.66
KWTXFM	CP 24	48C	Waco	TX		43.5		
RADD	ADD 24	49A	Nolanville	TX	0.00	0.0	115.0	-115.00
RDEL	DEL 24	48C	Waco	TX	89.23	192.3	165.0	-75.77
RADD	ADD 24	48C2	Marlin	TX	41.12	80.0	106.0	-64.88
RDEL	DEL 24	18C2	Waco	TX	59.32	38.0	106.0	-46.68
ALLO	RSV 24	19C1	Mcqueeney	TX	192.74	182.4	200.0	-7.26
KVCQ.C	CP 24	49C1	Mcqueeney	TX	193.88	181.8	200.0	-6.12
RDEL	DEL 24	19C1	Mcqueeney	ТX	205.04	205.2	200.0	5.04
RADD	ADD 24	19C1	Converse	TX	205.04	205.2	200.0	5.04
RADD	ADD 24	19C1	Converse	TX	205.04	205.2	200.0	5.04
KVLZ	LIC 25	52A	Gatesville	TX	41.39	343.7	31.0	10.39
KASZ.A	APP 25	52A	Gatesville	TX	41.39	343.7	31.0	10.39
KBFB	LIC 25	50C	Dallas	ТX	175.53	19.1	165.0	10.53
KVETFM	LIC 25	51C1	Austin	TX	87.98	193.8	75.0	12.98
RADD	ADD 24	17C1	Lakeway	ΤX	89.23	192.3	75.0	14.23
RADD	ADD 24	19C3	Mason	TX	159.74	255.6	142.0	17.74

FAX_WAS * Pg 7/10 Vax.25. 2003 1:50PV Reynolds Technical Associates

Channel 249C1 Converse Texas (KVCQ)

REFERENCE		DISPLAY DATES
29 25 07 N	CLASS = C1	DATA 04-24-03
98 29 02 W	Current Spacings	SEARCH 05-25-03
	- Channel 249 - 97.7 MHz	

Allocation Study

Call		Channel	Location		Dist	Azi	FCC	Margin
RADD	ADD	249C1	Converse	TX	0.00	0.0	245.0	-245.00
RADD	ADD	249C1	Converse	TX	0.00	0.0	245.0	-245.00
RDEL	DEL	249C1	Mcqueeney	ТX	0.00	0.0	245.0	-245.00
ALLO	RSV	249C1	Mcqueeney	ТX	79.95	94.8	245.0	-165.05
KVCQ.C	CP	249C1	Mcqueeney	TX	81.78	95.5	245.0	-163.22
RDEL	DEL	248C	Waco	TX	119.75	34.3	209.0	-89.25
KVCQ	LIC	249C3	Mcqueeney	TX	126.92	107.3	211.0	-84.08
KAJA	LIC	247C	San Antonio	TX	26.00	296.8	105.0	-79.00
\mathtt{RDEL}	DEL	247C	San Antonio	ТX	29.94	287.8	105.0	-75.06
RADD	ADD	249C3	Mason	TX	160.55	334.9	211.0	-50.45
RADD	ADD	250A	Batesville	TX	109.41	246.7	133.0	-23.59
RADD	ADD	250A	George West	TX	134.86	166.5	133.0	1.86
RADD	ADD	249A	Nolanville	TX	205,04	24.7	200.0	5.04
KFTX	LIC	248Cl	Kingsville	TX	204.94	155.0	177.0	27.94
ALLO		248	San Carlos	CI	238,39	260.1	209.0	29.39
KWTXFM	LIC	248C	Waco	TX	240.78	27.5	209.0	31.78
KWTXFM	CP	248C	Waco	TX	240.82	27.5	209.0	31.82
RADD	ADD	247Cl	Lakeway	TX	119.75	34.3	82.0	37.75
KVETFM	LIC	251C1	Austin	$\mathbf{T}\mathbf{X}$	120.10	33.1	82.0	38.10

Channel 249C1 McQueeney Texas (KVCQ) Allocation Study

29 25	EFERENCE 9 25 07 N						DATA	Y DATES 04-24-03 05-25-03
Call		Channel	Location		Dist	Azi	FCC	Margin
RADD RADD RDEL ALLO KVCQ.C RDEL KVCQ KAJA RDEL RADD RADD RADD RADD KFTX	ADD DEL RSV CP DEL LIC LIC DEL ADD ADD ADD ADD	249C1 249C1 249C1 248C 249C3 247C 247C 249C3 250A 250A 249A 248C1	Converse Converse Mcqueeney Mcqueeney Mcqueeney Waco Mcqueeney San Antonio San Antonio Mason Batesville George West Nolanville Kingsville	TX T	0.00 0.00 79.95 81.78 119.75 126.92 26.00 29.94 160.55 109.41 134.86 205.04 204.94	0.0 0.0 94.8 95.5 34.3 107.3 296.8 287.8 334.9 246.7 166.5 24.7 155.0	245.0 245.0 245.0 245.0 245.0 209.0 211.0 105.0 211.0 133.0 133.0 200.0 177.0	-79.00 -75.06 -50.45 -23.59 1.86 5.04 27.94
ALLO KWTXFM KWTXFM RADD KVETFM	CP ADD	248 248C 248C 247C1 251C1	San Carlos Waco Waco Lakeway Austin	CI TX TX TX TX	238.39 240.78 240.82 119.75 120.10	260.1 27.5 27.5 34.3 33.1	209.0 209.0 209.0 82.0 82.0	29.39 31.78 31.82 37.75 38.10

No.0359 P. 9

FAX_WAS * Pg 9/10 Ma+.25. 2003 ::50PM Reynolds Technical Associates

Channel 256A Ingram Texas (Vacant Channel 243A) Allocation Study

REFERENCE		DISPLAY DATES
30 04 30 N	CLASS = A	DATA 04-24-03
99 14 06 W	Current Spacings	SEARCH 05-25-03
	Channel 256 - 99.1 MHz	

Call	Chann	el Location		Dist	Azi	FCC	Margin
RADD	ADD 256A	Ingram	TX	0.00	0.0	115.0	-115.00
RADD	ADD 256A	Harper	TX	23.95	349.3	115.0	-91.05
KAYG	LIC 256A	Camp Wood	XT	85.32	242.2	115.0	-29.68
KLMOFM	CP 255C	1 Dilley	TX	125.57	182.0	133.0	-7.43
RADD	ADD 257A	Leakey	ТX	72.07	239.5	72.0	0.07
KBBT	LIC 253C	1 Schertz	ΤX	78.61	141.0	75.0	3.61
ALLO	USE 253C	1 Schertz	TX	78.61	141.0	75.0	3.61
KHHL	LIC 255C	1 Leander	TX	139.75	58.5	133.0	6.75
KHHL.C	CP 255C	2 Leander	TX	139.05	75.0	106.0	33.05
KLMOFM	LIC 255C	1 Dilley	TX	167.19	180.5	133.0	34.19
KISSFM	LIC 258C	San Antonio	TX	129.21	133.3	95.0	34.21
RADD	ADD 259A	Mason	TX	74.83	0.1	31.0	43.83

Mas.25, 2003 1:5^{-p}M Reyno ds Technical Associates

Channel 232A Flatonia Texas (Proposed Allotment) Allocation Study

REFERENCE		DISPLAY DATES
29 37 00 N	CLASS = A	DATA 04-24-03
97 12 44 W	Current Spacings	SEARCH 05-25-03
	Channel 232 - 94 3 MHz	

Call	Channel	Location		Dist	Az i	FCC	Margin
RADD	ADD 232A	Flatonia	TX	0.00	0.0	115.0	-115.00
RDEL	DEL 232A	Flatonia	TX	0.00	0.0	115.0	-115.00
RDEL	DEL 232A	Shiner	TX	20.37	182.7	115.0	-94.63
RADD	ADD 232A	Shiner	$\mathbf{T}\mathbf{X}$	20.37	182.7	115.0	-94.63
RADD	ADD 232A	Victoria	ТX	96,65	166.9	115.0	-18.35
KTBZFM	LIC 233C	Houston	TX	164.97	91.1	165.0	-0.03
KLBJFM	LIC 229C	Austin	TX	95.10	324.2	95.0	0.10
KAMX	LIC 234C	Luling	TX	96.66	324.4	95.0	1.66
KULF	LIC 231C3	Brenham	TX	96.42	52.5	89.0	7.42
ALLO	VAC 231C2	Brenham	TX	120.45	44.1	106.0	14.45
KULF.A	APP 231C2	Brenham	TX	120.45	44.1	106.0	14.45
KAJI	LIC 231C3	Point Comfort	TX	105.86	152.6	89.0	16.86
KAJI.C	CP 231C3	Point Comfort	ТX	109.06	150.3	89.0	20.06
KEMA	LIC 233C2	Three Rivers	$\mathbf{T}\mathbf{X}$	128.13	219.2	106.0	22.13
KHTZ	LIC 232A	Cameron	ХT	138.76	7.2	115.0	23.76
KLEYFM	LIC 231C2	Floresville	ТX	135.11	249.4	106.0	29.11
KEMA.A	APP 233C2	Three Rivers	ТX	135.1 7	224.1	106.0	29.17
KEMA.A	APP 233C2	Three Rivers	ТX	135.17	224.1	106.0	29.17
KRVL	LIC 232C2	Kerrville	TX	198.44	291.4	166.0	32.44
KBUK	LIC 285A	La Grange	TX	44.60	48.4	10.0	34.60
RADD	ADD 235C2	Ganado	TX	91.22	150.4	55.0	36.22
RDEL	DEL 231C3	Point Comfort	TX	131.82	145.2	89.0	42.82



CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I, Lisa Balzer, a secretary in the law firm of Vinson & Elkins, do hereby certify that on this 16th day of June, 2003, I caused copies of the foregoing "Petition for Reconsideration" to be mailed, first class postage prepaid, or hand delivered, addressed to the following persons:

*Robert Hayne, Esq.
Federal Communications Commission
Media Bureau
Audio Division
445 12th Street, S.W.
Room 3-A262
Washington, D.C. 20554

Matthew L. Leibowitz, Esq.
Joseph A. Belisle, Esq.
Leibowitz & Associates, P.A.
One Southeast Third Avenue
Suite 1450
Miami, FL 33131-1715
(Counsel to Next Media Licensing, Inc.)

Maurice Salsa 5615 Evergreen Valley Drive Kingwood, TX 77345

Dan J. Alpert, Esq. Law Office of Dan J. Alpert 2120 North 21st Road Suite 400 Arlington, VA 22201 (Counsel to M&M Broadcasters, Ltd.)

Gene A. Bechtel, Esq.
Law Office of Gene Bechtel, P.C.
1050 17th Street, N.W.
Suite 600
Washington, D.C. 20036
(Counsel to Elgin FM Limited Partnership and
Charles Crawford)

Robert Lewis Thompson, Esq. Thiemann, Aitken & Vohra, L.L.C. 908 King Street, Suite 300 Alexandria, VA 22314

(Counsel to AM & PM Broadcasting, L.L.C.)

Jeffrey D. Southmayd, Esq.
Southmayd & Miller
1220 19th Street, N.W.
Suite 400
Washington, D.C. 20036
(Counsel to The Sister Sherry Lynn Foundation, Inc.)

Texas Grace Communications, Inc. c/o Dave Garey P.O. Box 8481 Gulfport, Mississippi

Arthur V. Belendiuk, Esq. Smithwick & Belendiuk, P.C. 5028 Wisconsin Avenue, N.W. Suite 301 Washington, D.C. 20016 (Counsel to Dilley Broadcasters)

Stargazer Broadcasting, Inc. c/o David P. Garland 1110 Hackney Houston, TX 77023

BK Radio c/o Bryan King 1809 Lightsey Road Austin, TX 78704

Katherine Pyeatt 6655 Aintree Circle Dallas, TX 75214

Lisa M. Balzer